

Minutes
Otay Ranch POM Policy Committee Meeting
1800 Maxwell Road, Lunch Room
Chula Vista, CA 91911

January 23, 2008
1:00 - 4:00 p.m.

Approved by the POM Policy Committee on 04/30/08.
Motion to approve by Deputy Mayor Jerry Rindone.
Motion seconded by Supervisor Greg Cox.
Motion Carried 2/0.

ATTENDEES:

City of Chula Vista

Jerry Rindone, Deputy Mayor
Scott Tulloch, Assistant City Manager
Marisa Lundstedt, Principal Planner
Josie McNeeley, Associate Planner
Ed Batchelder, Advance Planning Manager
Glen Laube, Senior Planner
Tessa Quicho, Administrative Analyst
Boushra Salem, Senior Civil Engineer
Jack Griffen, Director of General Services
Ann Moore, City Attorney
David Miller, Deputy City Attorney II
Merce LeClaire, Senior Management Analyst
Amy Partosan, Administrative Analyst

County of San Diego

Chairman Greg Cox, 1st District Supervisor
Michael De La Rosa, District 1, Policy Advisor
Claudia Anzures, County Counsel
Renée Bahl, Director, Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR)
Maeve Hanley, Group Program Manager, DPR
Cheryl Goddard, Land Use Environmental Planner, DPR
Dahvia Lynch, Group Program Manager, Department of Planning and Land Use

Public

Susan Wynn, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
Cara McGary, USFWS
Amber Himes, CA Dept. of Fish and Game
Tom Tomlinson, McMillin
Ken Baumgartner, McMillin
Justin Craig, McMillin
Curt Noland, Otay Land Company
Bob Penner, Otay Land Company

Ranie Hunter, Otay Ranch Company
Don Ross, Otay Ranch Company
Lindsey Cavallaro, EDAW

ATTACHMENT A – Meeting Sign-in Sheet

Agenda Item Numbers noted in parentheses

1. Call to Order

(I.) Meeting called to order at 1:18 p.m. by County of San Diego/CHAIRMAN COX

2. Approval of Policy Committee Meeting Minutes of October 5, 2007

(II.) City of Chula Vista/DEPUTY MAYOR RINDONE motioned to approve the meeting minutes. Motion seconded by CHAIRMAN COX. Motion carried.

3. Public Comment on items not related to Agenda

(III.) CHAIRMAN COX opened and closed with no comment.

4. Status Report

(IV.A.1) County of San Diego/DAHVIA LYNCH reported on the following projects currently being process or to be processed by the County:

- **(IV.A.1.a)** General Plan Amendment (*initiated by Otay Project L.P.*) – Elimination of Conveyance Plan and the Coastal Sage Scrub Restoration Requirement

LYNCH stated that the project was approved on consent by the Board of Supervisors on December 5th, 2007.

- **(IV.A.1.b)** Environmental Subdivision (*initiated by McMillin*) – Otay Mesa

LYNCH stated that the project is located in Otay Mesa. Environmental documents will be ready for public review in February.

- **(IV.A.1.c)** Boundary Adjustments (2) (*initiated by McMillin*) – Otay Mesa

LYNCH stated that the both boundary adjustments were recorded in December 2007.

- **(IV.A.1.d)** Village 13 – Resort and Preserve Community (*initiated by Otay Project L.P.*)

LYNCH stated that Village 13 is anticipated to be completed by the end of 2008.

- **(IV.A.1.e)** Board Policy I-109 Otay Ranch Implementation Document Amendment (*initiated by the County of San Diego*) - Adoption of Phase 2 RMP and Preserve Boundary Modifications

LYNCH stated that County plans to update Phase 2 RMP and will bring this forward to the County Board of Supervisor for their consideration.

A timeline for this project has not yet been established.

(IV.A.2) City of Chula Vista/GLEN LAUBE provided background information on past Championship Off-Road Racing (CORR) Conditional Use Permits (CUP) from 2005-2007 and an update on the current CORR CUPs.

LAUBE reported that during the 2005-2006 CORR events, the City received one noise complaint but after additional review, it was concluded that the noise was actually from the Coors Amphitheater. The Police department reported no related incidents from the CORR events. The CORR events were held within the Village 2 development bubble.

LAUBE reported that during the 2007 CORR events, the City received one noise complaint in June and none in September. The CORR events were moved from the Village 2 development bubble to the quarry site.

LAUBE reported that the CORR has submitted a CUP application for a 10-year term. The City has asked for a better project description. Because the 10-year CUP application is in process and is not anticipated to be completed by this summer, the CORR has submitted a CUP application for the 2008 and 2009 CORR race season. The 2008 and 2009 CUP application is similar to that submitted for the 2007 CORR race season.

RANIE HUNTER submitted a handout to CHAIRMAN COX and DEPUTY MAYOR RINDONE. HUNTER stated the handout was related to the County's project to update Phase 2 RMP. The handout wanted confirmation that the presentation on this project is informational and that no action is being taken on it.

CHAIRMAN COX and DEPUTY MAYOR RINDONE agreed that no action was being taken on the update to Phase 2 RMP.

CHAIRMAN COX asked HUNTER if she had any comments on the CORR applications.

HUNTER did not have additional comments.

CHAIRMAN COX asked when the CORR race events are to occur for 2008.

HUNTER replied in July, September, and December. The CORR races are to be broadcasted on SPEED network and NBC.

(IV.A.3a) LYNCH reported on the Wolf Canyon Vacation/Substitution. LYNCH stated that the County and the City are currently processing IOD Vacations for IODs acknowledged by the POM. The IOD is to be vacated and substitution land in the same vicinity it to be offered for conveyance.

(IV.A.3b) CITY OF CHULA VISTA/ED BATCHELDER reported on the OVRP Trails Coordination occurring in eastern OVRP. BATCHELDER stated that JPB Development (JPB) approached the OVRP Joint Staff regarding trail planning from Heritage Road to lower Otay Lakes in September 2007. JPB and partners have purchased land from Stephen and Mary Birch in this area and have a majority interest in developing trails for this area.

BATCHELDER stated that JPB has submitted a binder containing regulation documents for this area. OVRP Joint Staff requested a summary of the binder which was submitted to them in December 2007.

BATCHELDER stated he envisions the trail coordination to go through a 3-phased review process through 1) OVRP and POM Joint Staff, 2) OVRP Citizens Advisory Committee, and 3) OVRP and POM EMT/PMT and Policy Committees. JPB will be preparing Conceptual Trail Plans including trail alignments, staging areas, and active and passive recreation areas. The Conceptual Trail Plans will be brought through the 3-phased review process outlined above. In the next step, JPB will be preparing a Trails Master Plan which will include more details such as construction drawings and cost estimates. This too will be brought through the 3-phased review process. OVRP and POM Joint Staff is to draft a process and timeline for this project. Joint Staff is to hold its next meeting to discuss this project on February 6th. The project will be discussed as an informational item at the next OVRP Citizens Advisory Committee meeting scheduled for February 15th.

CHAIRMAN COX asked what the initials JPB stood for.

HUNTER replied James P. Baldwin.

(IV.B) County of San Diego/CHERYL GODDARD presented the preserve status and stated that Preserve Status maps and matrixes have been provided as handouts.

(IV.B.1) Conveyed/Acquired/125-Mitigation Lands (Total: 3,252.27)

GODDARD stated that within the Otay Ranch project boundary, there are approximately 3,200 acres dedicated to open space. This has been achieved through conveyance of land to the POM, acquisitions by the City, the County, and 3rd Parties, and the purchase of mitigation lands by Caltrans. McMillin

has conveyed 517 acres to the POM for development of Villages 1 and 6. The City has acquired 776 acres within the Salt Creek area through a University Agreement entered in 2000 and a Conveyance Settlement Agreement entered in 2002. This land is being managed by the POM. The County has acquired 205 acres with CA Coastal Conservancy grant monies. This land is being managed by the County. Third party acquisitions within the Preserve total 1,500 acres with an additional 1,700 acres of developable land also purchased. This includes lands purchased by US. Fish and Wildlife Services, CA Dept. of Fish and Game (CDFG), and Trust for Public Lands. These lands are being managed by the 3rd parties who acquired them. Caltrans has purchased approximately 200 acres in Johnson Canyon. This includes 146 acres within the Preserve and 53 acres of developable area. Caltrans is responsible for the management of this land.

(IV.B.2) Pending Fee Title Transfers/IODs to be Accepted (Total: 565.528)

GODDARD stated that Status Summary Sheets and checklists on all pending conveyances have been made available as handouts. The first sheet of the checklist provides details to the property and a status summary of what needs to be done in order for the POM to accept the property. The second sheet is a checklist which outlines what is expected from the Applicant and from POM Staff in order to move the conveyance forward.

GODDARD stated that 565 acres is anticipated to be transferred to the POM by early next year. This includes 40 acres from Brookfield Shea. The County has accepted this IOD. The City is in the process of acceptance. 525 acres will be from the Otay Ranch Company. POM Staff has completed a site visit with the Applicant and is preparing a letter requesting updated Preliminary Title Reports, legal/physical access to the property.

(IV.B. 3) Pending Conveyances with Outstanding Issues (Total: 740.959)

GODDARD stated that there are 740 acres of pending conveyances. Outstanding issues include POM Staff to come to agreement addressing future infrastructure. This involves land within the Salt Creek area being offered by Brookfield Shea and within the Wolf Canyon area being offered by Otay Project L.P. Once resolved, this would allow the transfer of 182 acres to the POM.

Other outstanding issues include a small area within Wolf Canyon requiring MSS restoration and achievement of 5-year success criteria to be approved by the Wildlife Agencies, a half-acre property offered by McMillin Companies which has not been accepted due to the size and access issues to the property, and lastly, there are 558 acres north of Village 13 that have been acknowledged through IODs but have not been accepted pending the final approved development/preserve design for Village 13.

(IV.B.4) Acknowledged Conveyance Proposed for Vacation and Replacement

GODDARD stated that there are currently two IODs proposed for Vacation due to development footprint changes. The first is 32 acres in Wolf Canyon to be replaced within the same general area and the second is 254 acres within Village 13. The replacement land is currently proposed in a different configuration within Village 13 boundaries.

(IV.B.5) Preserve/Development Balance

GODDARD summarized the presented information, approximately 4,800 acres or 42% have been committed to the Preserve. This includes the lands that have been conveyed, acquired, or purchased and pending IODs. 3,250 acres have actually been dedicated to the open space (areas shown in green on the Powerpoint). Of this, approximately 1,300 acres is currently being managed by the POM. This means there is approximately 6,600 acres or 58% available for conveyance. This is in-step with development, which to date has all occurred within the City's boundaries. Approximately 4,000 acres have been developed or purchased by 3rd parties and approximately 5,600 acres is left for development. As shown, this follows the same percentages of Preserve buildout – 42% developed/purchased for open space and 58% left for development.

CHAIRMAN COX asked if there were any questions.

KEN BAUMGARTNER asked if there is 4800 acres committed to the Preserve but only 1300 acres is being managed by the POM, where is the CFD money going. Per the implementation of the MSCP, acres of the Preserve conveyed as a part of development should be managed and monitored. However it appears that development is occurring but the management of conveyance land is not. Additionally, McMillin has 10 acres of mitigation land dedicated as open space as a part of Rolling Hills. Rolling Hills is outside of the Otay Ranch boundary but would like to request that the POM take over management of this open space land.

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO/RENÉE BAHL stated that BAUMGARTNER has three questions: 1) How is Preserve land being managed, 2) Can POM provide accounting on CFD 97-2, and 3) Which lands are to be considered as a part of the Non-Otay Ranch Project Mitigation Lands Program.

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO/MAEVE HANLEY stated that POM is currently managing approximately 1300 acres. Funds from CFD 97-2 are being used for management. The funds are being used for the full-time Ranger that patrols the properties, consultants which will be conducting biological surveys, and County staff time for Hanley and Goddard.

BAUMGARTNER asked when development increases, does the tax assessment rate also increase.

CITY OF CHULA VISTA/MARISA LUNDSTEDT stated that POM recently increased the tax assessment rate because the POM is more active in managing the land and therefore requires additional funds. The POM is responsible for the management of approximately 1300 acres. All land purchased by third parties and current property owners are responsible for management of their lands. The CFD balance is slowly growing. As Preserve lands are being conveyed to the POM, the tax assessments being collected will increase based on the projected budget.

BAUMGARTNER asked if the assessment will be increased to its maximum rate.

LUNDSTEDT replied that the assessments will be increased if the budget calls for the increase.

BAUMGARTNER asked if the increase of the tax assessment is affected by the speed at which Preserve lands are being conveyed to the POM.

LUNDSTEDT stated yes.

BAUMGARTNER asked for clarification that the tax assessment will increase with Preserve land conveyances.

LUNDSTEDT stated that the tax assessment will increase for now but may eventually flatten since more people will be paying into the CFD.

CHAIRMAN COX asked what the maximum tax rate is.

CITY OF CHULA VISTA/TESSA QUICHO replied that the maximum tax rate is based on a calculation. For this fiscal year, the City levied as much as was needed per the projected budget, approximately \$300,000 and the fund balance at the end of the prior fiscal year.

CHAIRMAN COX asked about the status of the CFD reserve.

QUICHO stated that there is currently a healthy reserve in the amount of \$248,004.

DEPUTY MAYOR RINDONE stated again that the question goes back to what the actual maximum tax rate is.

LUNDSTEDT stated that POM Staff can look into that. Per today's agenda, we will be talking about Finance later.

SUSAN WYNN stated there are lots of discrepancies in Preserve acreages because USFWS and CDFG have bought land as a part of their commitment to the MSCP and so that the POM could focus on the management of other Otay Ranch Preserve lands.

TOM TOMLINSON asked if the lands purchased by the Wildlife Agencies were to offset development impacts.

WYNN stated no, but that the Wildlife Agencies did purchase both development and Preserve lands.

CHAIRMAN COX stated that the finance handout states the average tax assessment is \$46.73 which means there is a high and a low point.

QUICHO stated the tax assessment range is \$6.06 to \$50.

CHAIRMAN COX asked if the maximum tax assessment is \$50.

QUICHO stated that the maximum tax assessment is based on various factors such as square footage of home and various tax categories such as residential and commercial as well as improvement areas.

BAUMGARTNER asked if the amount of developable lands have diminished due to the Wildlife Agency purchases. And if so, has CFD been adjusted? What is the number of taxable parcels and what are the estimated revenues to be collected?

CHAIRMAN COX stated that developable lands should not have been diminished since the Wildlife Agencies purchased both developable and Preserve lands. Non-Otay Ranch Project Mitigation Land concerns will be dealt with later as listed on the agenda. CHAIRMAN COX asked if there were any additional comments or questions.

HUNTER stated that Otay Ranch Company has concerns over the letter they received on conveyance lands to be transferred to the POM. The letter asks that they place property markers at each corner of the properties. This can be done with GIS, however, some of the corners are on mountain tops.

CHAIRMAN COX directed POM Staff to work with Otay Ranch Company on this issue.

5. Conveyance Acceptance Strategy

(V.) HANLEY stated that the POM prefers transfer of fee title over Irrevocable Offer of Dedications (IODs). Transfer of fee title takes approximately 2.5 months to process. IODs will be accepted in certain occasions due to outstanding Wildlife Agencies' requirements and if there is a sufficient CFD budget to manage the land. Acknowledgement and Acceptance of IODs each takes approximately 2.5 months to process. Flowcharts depicting each process have been made available as a handout.

WYNN asked why the management of land couldn't just start if there is a funding mechanism in place that collects funds for the purpose of managing these lands.

HANLEY stated that POM Staff works on a 5-year budget to assure that money is available for management.

WYNN stated that she has concerns over when POM is to except an IOD for conveyance land. Specifically, why is isolated or limited access an issue? Since the County and the City both eliminated the Conveyance Schedule, any land proposed for conveyance should be accepted by the POM. Development should not occur until actual conveyance occurs.

HANLEY described an example of a parcel less than 1 acre in size that the POM has not accepted. The POM will not accept this land until adjacent land is accepted by the POM or a larger non-adjacent block of land is accepted.

LUNDSTEDT replied that the RMP states that conveyance is to occur prior to approval of Final Maps. Conveyance is to occur as fee title transfer or through an easement. The RMP should be amended to allow for more flexibility. Additionally, some developers bank land where there is no development attached. POM would not be able to manage these lands until CFD funds connected to development is available. Adequate access to the land is also needed for management.

WYNN asked for clarification that current land owners are responsible for management and monitoring of conveyed land.

LUNDSTEDT replied yes and clarified that lands proposed for conveyance would be managed by the current land owner until the land has been accepted by the POM, as this is stated in the RMP.

BAUMGARTNER stated that money is not available because the City is not collecting.

LUNDSTEDT stated that the City is collecting but at a lower rate because the City cannot collect over what they have in reserves. The City is bound by the CFD Special Tax Report.

WYNN stated that one or two acres in limbo is not a big deal, however larger acreages is a concern. POM needs to work on its commitment to the MSCP. Otay Ranch is only a piece of the MSCP. Someone needs to be responsible for the management of these lands.

LUNDSTEDT stated that the transfer of land from property owners to the POM should be seamless. Someone is managing the land it just depends on who at what point and time.

CHAIRMAN COX stated that there are upfront costs for fencing and security. Property owners want to transfer the land to the POM as soon as possible.

CHAIRMAN COX asked if there is currently a policy in place to collect CFD 97-2 Reserves. The policy should provide direction to when and how the CFD is collected.

BAUMGARTNER stated that the POM asking for physical access to conveyance land is a contradiction to the purpose of the Preserve. There are situations where one would need to get access from other property owners. This poses a problem.

HUNTER stated that legal and physical access is required and listed on all the pending IOD checklists.

LUNDSTEDT stated that finance will be discussed as Item 8 on the agenda. At that time, we will look at the budget and projected expenses. The budget provides projections of cost through 2013 for the Preserve. The projections include upfront costs. The 5-year projected budget was started to ensure that there is a healthy reserve.

DEPUTY MAYOR RINDONE asked what percent of the reserve balance is.

QUICHO stated that the percent is based on the prior year end fund balance and the current year's budget. For this fiscal year, the operational cost is projected at \$300,000 and the reserve is \$284,000. This means that the reserve is nearly 100%.

CHAIRMAN COX asked that we jump to Item 8 on the agenda – "Finance/CFD 97-2 Update"

LUNDSTEDT stated that on the finance spreadsheet provided as a handout, it shows the budget and operational costs including survey years. The spreadsheet includes revenues, expenditures, and projected budgets through 2014. POM Staff continually updates the projected costs for years further out.

LUNDSTEDT stated that for fiscal year 2007-2008, the beginning fund balance was \$284,044. The projected revenue from assessments is \$383,623 which will be paid in two installments. The 5-year budget was updated to reflect projected revenues from assessments. Expenses to date are \$35,553, pending County invoices totaling \$45,056.

WYNN asked if the ranger's time was paid for by the CFD.

LUNDSTEDT stated yes.

WYNN stated that this wasn't very much for a full-time ranger.

HANLEY stated that the amount being discussed is only for the first 6 months of the fiscal year.

LUNDSTEDT stated that by the next budget, there will be enough money for a second ranger.

AMBER HIMES asked what the per acre management cost is for POM managed land.

LUNDSTEDT stated that we do not know that amount at this time but we can look into that.

CHAIRMAN COX stated that the projected operations budget looks like it is holding steady and not increasing.

LUNDSTEDT stated that POM Staff is continually working together to have the operations budget that are further out (past 2009) reflect accurate projections.

TOM TOMLINSON asked if the actual operation and maintenance costs could be separated from administrative costs.

HANLEY stated that the full-time ranger is fully funded by the CFD. The ranger patrols the properties, ensures fencing is adequate, does basic stewardship of the land, assisted in pulling out a car from Salt Creek. The CFD also funds 25% of time for a County land use/environmental planner and 2 hours per week of her time.

6. Non-Otay Ranch Project Mitigation Land Program

(VI.) County of San Diego/MAEVE HANLEY stated that POM Staff developed eligibility and review criteria for non-Otay Ranch mitigation land. These criteria were approved by the POM Preserve Management Team on January 9th. These criteria are to be used by the POM in considering management of such land. Eligibility criteria include 1) Land must be located within the Otay Ranch Preserve boundary; 2) Applicant must be able to demonstrate that it is feasible to enter into a contractual agreement with the POM. The agreement would be based on the understanding that Applicant retains ownership of land and POM agrees to manage land to Otay Ranch Phase 2 Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Long-Term Implementation Program standards. POM and Applicant to execute contract, contract term to be determined; 3) Applicant must submit a Property Analysis Record (PAR) or similar cost analysis which includes an abbreviated habitat/resource tasks, detailed cost analysis, and annual work plans/budgets. The cost analysis must be acceptable to both the City and the County; 4) Applicant must meet POM Land Management Standards; 5) Land is free of environmental contamination liabilities; and 6) Applicant must provide evidence that legal and physical access have been obtained. Additionally the POM would take into consideration the subject land's adjacency to land currently being managed by the POM and the payment proposal.

CHAIRMAN COX asked if there were any comments.

TOMLINSON stated that McMillin is a developer interested in using this program. They received the criteria on January 9th at the last POM Preserve Management Team meeting and have not had an opportunity to fully review the criteria. There are big concerns for developers including that based on the criteria, the applicant would retain ownership of the land. The Wildlife Agencies require an owner and land manager in perpetuity.

CHAIRMAN COX asked if this is an item that should be continued to the next Policy Committee meeting.

CITY OF CHULA VISTA/TULLOCH stated that it would be productive to continue to hear the public's concern on this item.

TOMLINSON stated that if the POM does not take fee title, then the Program cannot be used by participants. The other concern is if the POM doesn't manage land over and above the RMP standards, the applicant would have to re-negotiate mitigation requirements with the Wildlife Agencies.

WYNN asked for clarification on conveyance land with Quino – will the POM take conveyance land with Quino even though it would require management and monitoring over and above what the RMP requires.

HANLEY stated that once the County's MSCP Quino Amendment is adopted, the County will adjust the RMP.

WYNN stated that this is the current reality for the City. The City has coverage for Quino and their mitigation lands will require management and monitoring of lands with Quino on it.

LYNCH stated that management costs will be addressed in the County's Quino amendment. The RMP can be updated to be consistent with the MSCP Quino Amendment.

WYNN stated that the need for the RMP to be consistent with MSCP is now since the City already has coverage for Quino.

TULLOCH stated that POM Staff should discuss why this criteria was drafted. It would be difficult for the ranger to be standing out there trying to figure out what management requirements are needed for which pieces of land.

TOMLINSON stated that if a cost analysis is to be completed and the POM is will to take over management of the land, then extra requirements shouldn't be a problem. McMillin will be drafting a comment letter on this item.

WYNN stated that the Wildlife Agency concerns relate to the goals of the MSCP. The MSCP should be managed efficiently. Since Otay Ranch has many different owners now, we are losing efficiency. We are setting ourselves up for multiple land managers which will result in inefficiency. It will be harder to deal with in the end. The Wildlife Agencies can appreciate cost and funding concerns. However, the Preserve should be looked at and analyzed as blocks of habitats and who makes most sense to manage it. Does it make most sense for the POM, County, City, USFWS, CDFG, Refuge, etc. to manage? MSCP is to run on regional funding. We need to be efficient.

BAHL stated that the purpose of the Program is to have a single land manager, the POM. The POM doesn't want ownership of the land but is willing to manage the land. County has and still offers to be an option as a land manager.

WYNN asked what the difference is between the County and the POM.

BAHL stated that the POM would manage the land but not take fee title.

TULLOCH stated that in perpetuity is a long time especially when you look at finance aspects of a program. It is harder than just trying to figure out the dollar amount to write on a check. The City has been through this problem with a similar CFD. The CFD had a built in escalator but there is still a problem with having a deficit in the budget. If federal regulations change, it can increase the cost of land management. Who knows in 10 years or 100 years from now what the cost will be. Funding needs to be assured in perpetuity.

WYNN stated that with a MSCP permit that both the County and the City have from the Wildlife Agencies, there are no surprises. The jurisdictions are only responsible for what is written into their permit. Anything over and above what is locked into the permit is the Wildlife Agencies' responsibility. It is surprising that the Caltrans property is excluded from this Program. Some of the Caltrans mitigation land is outside of the Otay Ranch Preserve and based on the criteria, they wouldn't even be considered for the Program. SR125 was crucial for the development of Otay Ranch.

HIMES stated that TOMLINSON touched on a Wildlife Agency concern. If the POM is to only manage to RMP standards, the applicant and Wildlife Agencies will need to renegotiate mitigation requirements. An exercise would need to be completed to see what, if anything, is lost by only managing to RMP standards. However, if there is funding available for these additional requirements, then the POM should consider managing to these extra requirements.

BAUMGARTNER agrees with the Wildlife Agencies. If the Refuge takes the lands east of Otay Lakes, then the POM can focus on western Preserve lands.

DEPUTY MAYOR RINDONE stated that no one can control all circumstances. Things will happen that we can't anticipate.

CHAIRMAN COX asked to continue the item to the next Policy Committee meeting. If you have specific issues, please submit them in writing to POM Staff. What the POM needs to consider for this Program is funding mechanisms and the ramifications if the funding is not enough to manage the land.

CHAIRMAN COX directed staff to look at the public's concerns on this Program.

TOMLINSON stated that McMillin held a meeting with POM Staff and their finance consultant to discuss funding mechanisms,

CURT NOLAND stated he would be sending in written comments on this Program.

7. Long-Term Implementation Program

(VII.) HANLEY stated that the Long-Term Implementation Program is currently out for public review with comments due on February 4th. The Program will not actually be implemented until the County takes Phase 2 RMP to the Board of Supervisors for their consideration in adopting the document in its entirety.

WYNN stated that she received the notice last week and asked if they could receive an extension to submit comments.

HANLEY replied yes, just let POM Staff know how much time is needed.

WYNN stated she would email HANLEY.

LUNDSTEDT stated that the Long-Term Implementation Program is a summary of the RMPs and that there aren't additional requirements or new information other than information on the recent fires.

HUNTER asked when the County anticipates taking Phase 2 RMP to the Board.

LYNCH stated that a date has not yet been established.

8. Finance/CFD 97-2 Update

(VIII.) LUNDSTEDT reported on CFD 97-2 earlier in the meeting, please see Item 5 above.

9. Eastern Otay Valley Regional Park (OVRP) Trails Planning

(IX.) BATCHELDER reported on this item earlier in the meeting, please see Item IV.A.3b above.

10. Discussions with the San Diego National Wildlife Refuge

(X.) HANLEY reported that the "1995 Baldwin Agreement" and RMP2 state that the Refuge is to operate and maintain lands east of Otay Lakes at no cost to the Otay Ranch projects. POM Staff met with Refuge staff on December 10th. POM Staff will be writing a detailed proposal for the Refuge including proposed acreage and timeline of land to be transferred. Refuge staff to review proposal and discuss with ecological partners, i.e. USFWS Ecological Division, CDFG, Washington, DC Office.

11. Proposed 2008 POM Meeting Schedule

(XI.) HANLEY stated that the following POM Preserve Management Team meetings have been proposed but not confirmed:

March 3rd:	1:00 - 5:00 pm
March 5th:	1:00 - 4:00 pm
March 7th:	1:00 - 4:00 pm
May 28th:	9:00 am - 12:00 pm
June 10th:	10:00 am - 12:00 pm
September 10th:	9:00 am - 12:00 pm or 3:00 - 5:00 pm
September 12th:	1:00 - 4:00 pm
December 10th:	2:00 - 5:00 pm

Locations TBD

HANLEY stated that the following POM Policy Committee meetings have been scheduled and confirmed:

April 30th – County Administration Center

July 17th – City of Chula Vista

October 30th – County Administration Center

All meetings are to be held from 2-5:00pm

CHAIRMAN COX clarified that this is an informational item and that no action is needed.

DEPUTY MAYOR RINDONE asked that the room for the Policy Committee meetings, when held in the City, be setup similar to the County's setup.

12. Adjournment

(XII.) CHAIRMAN COX adjourned the meeting at 2:50pm.

ATTACHMENT A

MEETING SIGN-IN SHEET

MEETING SIGN-IN SHEET	
Project: Otay Ranch Preserve Owner/Manager (POM) Policy Committee Meeting	Meeting Date/Time: January 23, 2008, 1:00 – 4:00 pm
Place/Room: 1800 Maxwell Road, Lunch Room, Chula Vista, CA 91911	

Name	Organization	Phone	E-Mail
Cheryl Gaddard	CoSD - DPR	858 91061374	cheryl.gaddard@sedwnty.ca.gov
MAVE HANLEY	CoSD, DPR	858 966-1371	mave.hanley@sedwnty.ca.gov
RANIE HUNTER	Otay Ranch	619- 234-4050	rhunter@otayranch.com
Amber Himes	CDFG	858-637- 7100	ahimes@dfg.ca.gov
Lindsey Cavallaro	EDAW	619-233- 1454	lindsey.cavallaro@edaw.com
Glen Kubke	Chula Vista	619 476 2329	gkubke@ci.chula-vista.ca.us
Tom Tomlinson	McMillin	619 794-1304	TTomlinson@mcmillin.com
Ken Baumgartner	McMillin	619 794-1210	KBaumgartner@McMillin.com
DON ROSS	Otay Ranch	619-2344050	Don@otayranch.com
Susan Wynn	USFWS	760 431-9440	Susan-Wynn@fws.gov
Cara McGarry	USFWS	" ext. 374	Cara-McGarry@fws.gov
Bob Penner	Otay Land	760 420-3472	bpenner@HFC-CA.com
Justin Craig	McMillin	619 794-1323	jcraig@McMillin.com
CHRIS NOZAND	OLE	760 918 8200	CNOZAND@HFC-CA.com
Jack Goff	CV	619 397-6080	